

The asymptotic stability of solitons in the cubic NLS equation on the line

Scipio Cuccagna* and Dmitry E. Pelinovsky†

February 7, 2013

Abstract

We use the inverse scattering transform, the auto-Bäcklund transformation and the steepest descent method of Deift and Zhou to obtain the asymptotic stability of the solitons in the cubic NLS (nonlinear Schrödinger) equation.

1 Introduction

We consider the Cauchy problem for the cubic focusing NLS (nonlinear Schrödinger) equation on $\mathbb{R}$:

$$iu_t + u_{xx} + 2|u|^2u = 0, \quad u(0) = u_0. \quad (1.1)$$

The Cauchy problem (1.1) is globally well posed in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, by the following result due to Tsutsumi [24].

Theorem 1.1. *Given $u_0 \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$, then there exists a unique solution*

$$u(t) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, L^2(\mathbb{R})) \cap L^4_{loc}(\mathbb{R}, L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$$

of the integral equation

$$u(t) = e^{it\partial_x^2}u_0 + 2i \int_0^t e^{i(t-s)\partial_x^2}|u(s)|^2u(s)ds. \quad (1.2)$$

We have $\|u(t)\|_{L^2} = \|u_0\|_{L^2}$. Furthermore, if $u_{0n} \rightarrow u_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $u_n(t)$ is the solution of the NLS equation with $u_n(0) = u_{0n}$, then, as $n \rightarrow \infty$, for any $t \in \mathbb{R}$ we have $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

*Department of Mathematics and Geosciences, University of Trieste, Trieste, 34127 Italy, e-mail: scuccagna@units.it

†Department of Mathematics and Statistics, McMaster University, Hamilton ON, Canada, L8S 4K1, e-mail: dmpeli@math.mcmaster.ca

Remark 1.2. An important class of solutions of the NLS equation are the solitons, defined by

$$\varphi_{\omega,\gamma,v}(t, x - x_0) := \omega e^{ixv + i(\omega^2 - v^2)t + i\gamma} \operatorname{sech}(\omega(x - 2vt - x_0)). \quad (1.3)$$

We are interested here to the question of their asymptotic stability, when u_0 is close to $\varphi_{\omega,\gamma,v}$ for a particular (ω, γ, v) .

Notations: the following Hilbert spaces are the closures of the space $C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R})$ with respect to the following norms, where $\langle x \rangle := \sqrt{1 + |x|^2}$:

$L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$ defined with $\|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} := \|\langle x \rangle^s u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$;

$\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R})$ defined with $\|u\|_{\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R})} := \| |x|^s \hat{u} \|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$ where $\hat{u}$ is the Fourier transform;

$H^s(\mathbb{R})$ defined with $\|u\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} := \|\langle x \rangle^s \hat{u}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$, such that $H^s(\mathbb{R}) = \dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$.

We also denote $\Sigma_s := H^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$. For convenience, we will list both arguments (t, x) in the solution u of the Cauchy problem (1.1). Our aim is to prove the following result.

Theorem 1.3. *Consider the NLS soliton $\varphi_{\omega_0,\gamma_0,v_0}(0, x - x_0)$. Then, there exist positive constants $\varepsilon_0 = \varepsilon_0(\omega_0, v_0)$, $T = T(\omega_0, v_0)$ and $C = C(\omega_0, v_0)$ such that if $u_0 \in L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ and if*

$$\epsilon := \|\varphi_{\omega_0,\gamma_0,v_0}(0, \cdot - x_0) - u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0, \quad (1.4)$$

then there exist two ground states $\varphi_{\omega_\pm,\gamma_\pm,v_\pm}(t, x - x_\pm)$ such that for the solution of the Cauchy problem (1.1) provided by Theorem 1.1, we have

$$|(\omega_\pm, \gamma_\pm, v_\pm, x_\pm) - (\omega_0, \gamma_0, v_0, x_0)| < C\epsilon \quad (1.5)$$

and, for all $\pm t \geq T$,

$$\|u(t, \cdot) - \varphi_{\omega_\pm,\gamma_\pm,v_\pm}(t, \cdot - x_\pm)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < C\epsilon |t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (1.6)$$

A key ingredient for the above result comes from the methods of the inverse scattering transform (IST) theory, found in references [3, 27, 13, 12, 14]. In particular, we use the steepest descent method and the auto-Bäcklund transformation discussed in [10]. Theorem 1.3 is an analogue of the results about the asymptotic behavior of solutions decaying to 0, obtained in [13, 16, 12, 14, 10]. Compared to these references, we do not reproduce in Theorem 1.3 the asymptotic expansions of the solution u for large values of t .

Theorem 1.3 should be contrasted to the results for non-integrable systems, where the orbits of the solitons towards which the solution $u(t)$ is attracted, are presumably not the same as $t \rightarrow +\infty$ and $t \rightarrow -\infty$, see [22, 4, 21] for early results. In the case of the cubic NLS equation, it turns out that the selected asymptotic soliton is simply defined by the eigenvalue of a spectral problem supported by the initial datum u_0 but it has a different reflection coefficient, which is zero for the solitons (1.3) and nonzero for a generic u_0 .

Another feature of non-integrable systems, is that the rate of decay in the right hand side of (1.6) is generally slower, because of metastable states which are not present for the

cubic NLS equation. The theory how to treat these metastable states was initiated in [5, 23] and for recent developments and further references we refer to [6, 7, 8, 2]. Obviously the absence of metastable states for the cubic NLS equation simplifies the discussion. Notice that [17] conjectures the non-existence of metastable states in integrable systems.

Theorem 1.3 appears to be out of reach of the perturbative methods initiated in [22, 4, 21] and developed in a number of papers using a similar framework. This is because of the "strength" of the cubic nonlinearity in the cubic NLS equation. This strength is responsible for the fact that the classical result in [18] on the dispersion of small solutions of L^2 subcritical equations does not apply to the cubic NLS equation and was proved only a decade later in [16], with an approach similar to [18] but with an additional normal form argument. The results in [18, 16] are based on *invariant fields* which exploit symmetries of the equations not present in the case of the linearization of an NLS at a soliton. And while [18] has been partially extended to settings without translation symmetry in [9], it remains still an open question whether it is possible to apply the approach in [18, 16] directly to the problem of asymptotic stability of the solitons.

Mizumachi and Pelinovsky [19] proposed to treat the orbital stability of solitons of the cubic NLS equation by using an auto-Bäcklund transformation which transforms a soliton in the zero solution and preserves the equation. They proved that the Bäcklund transformation is a homeomorphism in L^2 . The Bäcklund transformation can then be used to transfer Theorem 1.1 into a statement about solutions close to the soliton in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, in particular proving that solitons of the cubic NLS equation are orbitally stable in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$, thus transposing to $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ the classical result of orbital stability proved for the space $H^1(\mathbb{R})$ in [25]. In [19], a discussion was initiated on the possible use of the same transformation to transfer the dispersion scattering result for small solutions in [16] to an asymptotic stability result for solitons in Σ_1 . However it is an open question whether or not the Bäcklund transformation in [19] is a homeomorphism in Σ_1 .

The inspiration for the present paper comes however from a paper by Deift and Park [10], where there is a particularly simple and explicit Bäcklund transformation, see (4.3) later. Using the steepest descent method of Deift and Zhou [11] it is possible to bound all the terms of formula (4.3) and prove Theorem 1.3. Specifically, by means of direct scattering, it is possible to derive the spectral data associated with the solution u of the Cauchy problem (1.1). Then, from mapping properties of the inverse scattering transform proved in [27, 12], which are similar to mapping properties of the inverse Fourier transform, the solution u is expressed by means of the transformation formula (4.3) as the sum of a pure radiation solution $\tilde{u}$ and an appropriate fraction of Jost functions associated to the potential $\tilde{u}$. The results in [12, 14, 10] are applied directly to the pure radiation solution $\tilde{u}$. Also Jost functions and their fraction can be easily analyzed using other results from [12, 14, 10]. This yields Theorem 1.3.

We do not make any particular claim of originality, since Theorem 1.3 is a natural corollary of the previous works [12, 14, 10]. Nonetheless, we feel that it is important that Theorem 1.3 be stated explicitly and proved.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 gives details of the direct and inverse scat-

tering transforms for the cubic NLS equation. Section 3 contains a review of the asymptotic scattering theory for the pure radiation solution. Section 4 explains the arguments needed to prove the asymptotic stability of solitons formulated in Theorem 1.3.

Acknowledgements. S.C. was partially funded by a grant FRA 2009 from the University of Trieste and by the grant FIRB 2012 (Dinamiche Dispersive). D.P. was partially funded by the NSERC Discovery grant.

2 Direct and Inverse Scattering Transforms

The Cauchy problem (1.1) for the cubic NLS equation can be solved through the direct and inverse scattering transform.

Consider a function $u(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R})$ and recall that $L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$ is embedded into $L^1(\mathbb{R})$ for any $s > \frac{1}{2}$. The spectral system associated with the cubic NLS equation takes the form:

$$\psi_x = -iz\sigma_3\psi + Q(u(x))\psi, \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$Q(u(x)) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u(x) \\ -\bar{u}(x) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_3 := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Set $e_1 = (1, 0)^T$ and $e_2 = (0, 1)^T$. According to the direct scattering theory [1], for any fixed $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$ (i.e. $\text{Im } z > 0$) there exists a unique $\mathbb{C}^2$ valued solution $\phi(x, z)$ of the spectral system (2.1) such that

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \phi(x, z)e^{ixz} = e_1 \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \phi(x, z)e^{ixz} = a(z)e_1, \quad (2.2)$$

where $a(z)$ is an analytic function in $\mathbb{C}_+$, continuous in $\overline{\mathbb{C}}_+$ with $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} a(z) = 1$. We call $a(z)$ the *scattering function*. The following result is well known (see, i.e., [1, 3]).

Lemma 2.1. *There exists an open dense set $\mathcal{G} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$ of generic potentials u such that, for $u \in \mathcal{G}$, the scattering function $a(z)$ has at most a finite number of zeros forming a set $\mathcal{Z}_+ = \{z_1, \dots, z_n\}$ in $\mathbb{C}_+$, with $a(z) \neq 0$ for all $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $a'(z_k) \neq 0$ for all k . The cardinality $u \rightarrow \#\mathcal{Z}_+$ is locally constant near u in $\mathcal{G}$ and the map $\mathcal{G} \ni u \rightarrow (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}_+^n$ is locally Lipschitz.*

Remark 2.2. The open set of generic potentials $\mathcal{G}$ includes the solitons (1.3). This implies that given the solitons (1.3), which correspond to $n = 1$, small L^1 -perturbations to the solitons do not change the cardinality $\#\mathcal{Z}_+ = 1$. See [20] for other integrable equations, where this is not true.

There exists a unique $\mathbb{C}^2$ valued solution $\psi(x, z)$ of the spectral system (2.1) satisfying

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(x, z)e^{-ixz} = e_2. \quad (2.3)$$

If $u \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\mathcal{Z}_+ \neq \emptyset$, then for each $z_k \in \mathcal{Z}_+$ we have $\phi(x, z_k) = \gamma_k \psi(x, z_k)$ for some $\gamma_k \in \mathbb{C}_* := \mathbb{C} \setminus \{0\}$. Set $c_k = \gamma_k / a'(z_k)$ and call it *the norming constant*.

For $z \in \mathbb{R}$, the solution of the spectral system (2.1) with the boundary value

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow -\infty} \phi(x, z) e^{ixz} = e_1 \quad (2.4)$$

satisfies the scattering problem

$$\lim_{x \rightarrow +\infty} [\phi(x, z) e^{ixz} - a(z) e_1 - e^{2ixz} b(z) e_2] = 0, \quad (2.5)$$

where $b(z)$ is a continuous function on $\mathbb{R}$. Set $r(z) := \frac{b(z)}{a(z)}$ and call it the *reflection coefficient*.

We consider now the Jost functions defined by the Volterra integral equations, see [1],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{m}_1^\pm(x, z) &= e_1 + \int_{\pm\infty}^x \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2i(x-y)z} \end{pmatrix} Q(u(y)) \mathbf{m}_1^\pm(y, z) dy, \\ \mathbf{m}_2^\pm(x, z) &= e_2 + \int_{\pm\infty}^x \begin{pmatrix} e^{-2i(x-y)z} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} Q(u(y)) \mathbf{m}_2^\pm(y, z) dy. \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

The functions $\mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z)$ and $\mathbf{m}_2^+(x, z)$ are analytic for $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$, whereas the functions $\mathbf{m}_2^-(x, z)$ and $\mathbf{m}_1^+(x, z)$ are analytic for $z \in \mathbb{C}_-$, [1].

Remark 2.3. In terms of functions ϕ and ψ introduced in (2.2) and (2.3), we have $\mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z) = \phi(x, z) e^{ixz}$ and $\mathbf{m}_2^+(x, z) = \psi(x, z) e^{-ixz}$ for $z \in \mathbb{C}_+$.

It follows from the scattering problem (2.5) and the Wronskian identities for the spectral system (2.1), we have for $z \in \mathbb{R}$,

$$a(z) = \det[\mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z), \mathbf{m}_2^+(x, z)] \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$b(z) = \det[\mathbf{m}_1^+(x, z), e^{-2ixz} \mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z)], \quad (2.8)$$

where matrices $[\cdot, \cdot]$ are defined in the sense of column vectors and the Wronskian determinants are x -independent. The following result is obtained with a minor modification of the argument in Theorem 3.2 [12].

Lemma 2.4. *Let $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. For $u \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G}$ we have $r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, the map $L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G} \ni u \rightarrow r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ is locally Lipschitz.*

Proof. We make the following claim: for any fixed $\kappa_0 > 0$ there exists a positive constant C such that if $\|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \kappa_0$, then we have for $j = 1, 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{m}_j^-(x, z) - e_j\|_{H_z^s(\mathbb{R})} &\leq C \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \quad \text{for all } x \leq 0 \\ \|\mathbf{m}_j^+(x, z) - e_j\|_{H_z^s(\mathbb{R})} &\leq C \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \quad \text{for all } x \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (2.9)$$

Let us assume (2.9) for a moment. Then $b \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ because

$$\begin{aligned} b(z) &= \det[\mathbf{m}_1^+(0, z), \mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z)] \\ &= \det[\mathbf{m}_1^+(0, z) - e_1, \mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z) - e_1] \\ &\quad + \det[\mathbf{m}_1^+(0, z) - e_1, e_1] + \det[e_1, \mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z) - e_1], \end{aligned} \quad (2.10)$$

where we recall that $H^s(\mathbb{R})$ is a Banach algebra with respect to pointwise multiplication for any $s > \frac{1}{2}$. Similarly, $(a - 1) \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ because

$$\begin{aligned} a(z) &= \det [\mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z), \mathbf{m}_2^+(0, z)] \\ &= \det [\mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z) - e_1, \mathbf{m}_2^+(0, z)] + \det [e_1, \mathbf{m}_2^+(0, z) - e_2] + \det [e_1, e_2] \\ &= 1 + \det [\mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z) - e_1, \mathbf{m}_2^+(0, z) - e_2] \\ &\quad + \det [e_1, \mathbf{m}_2^+(0, z) - e_2] + \det [\mathbf{m}_1^-(0, z) - e_1, e_2]. \end{aligned} \quad (2.11)$$

We conclude that if $u \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G}$ then $r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$. So this shows that we have a map $L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G} \ni u \rightarrow r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$. We skip the proof of the fact that the map $L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G} \ni u \rightarrow r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ is locally Lipschitz.

We now prove (2.9). It suffices to consider the case $j = 1$ and the minus sign only. The proof is based on the fact that if there is $s \in (0, 1]$ such that for an $f \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ we have

$$\|f(\cdot + h) - f(\cdot)\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C|h|^s, \quad \forall h \in \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.12)$$

then $f \in H^s(\mathbb{R}) = \dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and there is a positive constant c independent of f , such that $\|f\|_{\dot{H}^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq c C$.

Let us define

$$Kf(x, z) := \int_{-\infty}^x \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2i(x-y)z} \end{pmatrix} Q(u(y))f(y, z)dy.$$

By Lemma 3.2 [12] (see also [1]), we have

$$\|Ke_2\|_{L_x^\infty(\mathbb{R}, L_z^2(\mathbb{R}))} \leq \|u\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}$$

and for any $x_0 \leq +\infty$,

$$\|(1 - K)^{-1}\|_{L_x^\infty((-\infty, x_0), L_z^2(\mathbb{R})) \rightarrow L_x^\infty((-\infty, x_0), L_z^2(\mathbb{R}))} \leq e^{\sqrt{2}\|u\|_{L^1}}.$$

Furthermore, for $x \leq 0$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z) - e_2\|_{L_z^2(\mathbb{R})} &\leq e^{\sqrt{2}\|u\|_{L^1}} \left\| \int_{-\infty}^x e^{2i(x-y)z} \overline{u}(y) dy \right\|_{L_z^2(\mathbb{R})} \\ &\leq e^{\sqrt{2}\|u\|_{L^1}} \left(\int_{-\infty}^x \langle y \rangle^{2s} |u(y)|^2 dy \right)^{1/2} \langle x \rangle^{-s} \\ &\leq e^{\sqrt{2}\|u\|_{L^1}} \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \langle x \rangle^{-s}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

To complete the proof of (2.9) for $j = 1$ and the minus sign it is enough to prove and estimate of the form (2.12) with $C \lesssim \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})}$. Define $n(x, z) := \mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z + h) - \mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z)$ for $h \in \mathbb{R}$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} (1 - K)n(x, z) &= \int_{-\infty}^x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2i(x-y)(z+h)} - e^{2i(x-y)z} \end{pmatrix} Q(u(y))(\mathbf{m}_1^-(y, z) - e_1) dy \\ &\quad + \int_{-\infty}^x \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ e^{2i(x-y)(z+h)} - e^{2i(x-y)z} & \overline{u}(y) \end{pmatrix} dy. \end{aligned} \quad (2.14)$$

Using the Fourier transform $\mathcal{F}$, we have for $x \leq 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \int_{-\infty}^x \left(e^{2i(x-y)(z+h)} - e^{2i(x-y)z} \right) \overline{u}(y) dy \right\|_{L_z^2} \\ &= \|\mathcal{F}^*[u(\cdot+x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-}](z+h) - \mathcal{F}^*[u(\cdot+x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-}](z)\|_{L_z^2} \\ &\leq C\|\mathcal{F}^*[u(\cdot+x)\chi_{\mathbb{R}_-}](z)\|_{H_z^s(\mathbb{R})}|h|^s = \|u(y+x)\|_{L_y^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}_-)}|h|^s \leq \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})}|h|^s \end{aligned} \quad (2.15)$$

and, using estimate (2.13),

$$\begin{aligned} \|\text{first term r.h.s. (2.14)}\|_{L_z^2} &\leq 2^{1-s}|h|^s \int_{-\infty}^x |y|^s |u(y)| \|\mathbf{m}_1^-(y, z) - e_2\|_{L_z^2(\mathbb{R})} dy \\ &\leq 2^{1-s}|h|^s e^{\|u\|_{L^1}} \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \int_{-\infty}^x |y|^s \langle y \rangle^{-s} |u(y)| dy \leq 2^{1-s}|h|^s e^{\|u\|_{L^1}} \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \|u\|_{L^1}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

Then, by (2.14)–(2.16) we get $\|\mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z+h) - \mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z)\|_{L_z^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq C|h|^s \|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})}$ for $x \leq 0$, where C is a fixed constant and $\|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \leq \kappa_0$, for a preassigned bound κ_0 . This implies that for all $x \leq 0$ we have $\|\mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z) - e_1\|_{\dot{H}_z^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})}$ for some positive constant C . Combined with (2.13) this yields the claim (2.9) for $j = 1$ and for the minus sign. The other cases are similar. $\square$

Lemma 2.4 provides the direct scattering information we need. Now we recall a number of facts about inverse scattering. The spectral data in the space

$$\mathcal{S}(s, n) := \{r(z) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}), \quad (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}_+^n, \quad (c_1, \dots, c_n) \in \mathbb{C}_*^n\} \quad (2.17)$$

are used to recover the potential u in matrix $Q(u)$ of the spectral system (2.1). Set

$$V_x(z) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 + |r(z)|^2 & e^{-2ixz}\overline{r}(z) \\ e^{2ixz}r(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.18)$$

and consider the following Riemann–Hilbert (RH) problem:

- (i) $m(x, \cdot)$ is meromorphic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$;
- (ii) $m(x, \cdot)$ has continuous boundary values $m_{\pm}(x, \cdot)$ on $\mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$m_+(x, z) = m_-(x, z)V_x(z);$$

- (iii) $\lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} m(x, z) = 1$;

- (iv) $m(x, z)$ has simple poles in $\mathcal{Z} = \mathcal{Z}_+ \cup \mathcal{Z}_-$, where $\mathcal{Z}_- = \{\bar{z}_1, \dots, \bar{z}_n\}$ in $\mathbb{C}_-$, and for each $z_k \in \mathcal{Z}_+$ and $\bar{z}_k \in \mathcal{Z}_-$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Res}_{z=z_k} m(x, z) &= \lim_{z \rightarrow z_k} m(x, z)V_x(z_k), \\ \text{Res}_{z=\bar{z}_k} m(x, z) &= \lim_{z \rightarrow \bar{z}_k} m(x, z)V_x(\bar{z}_k), \end{aligned} \quad (2.19)$$

with

$$V_x(z_k) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ e^{2ixz_k c_k} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_x(\bar{z}_k) := \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -e^{-2ix\bar{z}_k \bar{c}_k} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.20)$$

From the solution of the RH problem (i)–(iv), the potential u in matrix $Q(u)$ is found by means of *the reconstruction formula*:

$$u(x) := 2i \lim_{z \rightarrow \infty} z m_{12}(x, z). \quad (2.21)$$

Remark 2.5. In terms of the analytic functions $\mathbf{m}_{1,2}^\pm$ introduced from the Volterra integral equations (2.6), we have the equalities

$$m_+(x, z) = \left[a(z)^{-1} \mathbf{m}_1^-(x, z), \mathbf{m}_2^+(x, z) \right], \quad m_-(x, z) = \left[\mathbf{m}_1^+(x, z), \overline{a(\bar{z})}^{-1} \mathbf{m}_2^-(x, z) \right].$$

We introduce now the Cauchy operator $C_{\mathbb{R}}$ acting on functions $h(z) \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$,

$$(C_{\mathbb{R}}h)(z) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{h(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta, \quad z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}, \quad (2.22)$$

with the boundary values

$$(C_{\mathbb{R}}^\pm h)(z) = \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{h(\zeta)}{\zeta - (z \pm i\varepsilon)} d\zeta, \quad z \in \mathbb{R}.$$

The solution $m(x, z)$ of the RH problem (i)–(iv) is given by the following formula:

$$m(x, z) = 1 + \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{M_x(\zeta) V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{M_x(\zeta) (V_x(\zeta) - 1)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta, \quad (2.23)$$

where $M_x(z)$ is defined for $z \in \mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{Z}$ in the space $M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{C})$ of complex 2×2 matrices and satisfies system (2.24)–(2.25) written below.

Lemma 2.6 below implies that the map $\mathcal{G} \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(s, n)$, which is defined by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4, is one-to-one. This result is due to Zhou [27], but we prove it for completeness, following the argument in Lemma 5.2 [10].

Lemma 2.6. *Let $r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$ with $s > 1/2$. Then, for any $x \in \mathbb{R}$ there exists and is unique a solution $M_x : \mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{C})$ of the following system of integral and algebraic equations:*

$$M_x(z) = 1 + \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{M_x(\zeta) V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + \lim_{\varepsilon \searrow 0} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{M_x(\zeta) (V_x(\zeta) - 1)}{\zeta - (z - i\varepsilon)} d\zeta, \quad z \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.24)$$

and

$$M_x(z) = 1 + \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{z\}} \frac{M_x(\zeta) V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{M_x(\zeta) (V_x(\zeta) - 1)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z} \quad (2.25)$$

such that $(M_x(z) - 1) \in L_z^2(\mathbb{R})$.

Proof. For the operator C_{V_x} defined by $C_{V_x}h := C^-(h(V_x - 1))$, the system of integral and algebraic equations (2.24) and (2.25) reduces to

$$(1 - C_{V_x})(M_x - 1) - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{M_x(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} = C_{V_x}1, \quad z \in \mathbb{R} \quad (2.26)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} M_x(z) - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{z\}} \frac{M_x(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(M_x(\zeta) - 1)(V_x(\zeta) - 1)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta \\ = 1 + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{(V_x(\zeta) - 1)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.27)$$

By Lemma 5.2 [10], there exists a fixed c such that, for $\|r\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} = \rho$, the operator $1 - C_{V_x}$ is invertible in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$ and $\|(1 - C_{V_x})^{-1}\|_{L^2 \rightarrow L^2} \leq c(\rho)^2$. It is easy to conclude by the Fredholm alternative, that the inhomogeneous system (2.26)–(2.27) admits exactly one solution if and only if the only solution $f : \mathbb{R} \cup \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow M_{2 \times 2}(\mathbb{C})$ of the homogeneous version of the system (2.26)–(2.27) with $f|_{\mathbb{R}} \in L^2(\mathbb{R})$ is $f = 0$. We set for $z \in \mathbb{C} \setminus (\mathcal{Z} \cup \mathbb{R})$

$$m(z) := \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{f(\zeta)(V_x(\zeta) - 1)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta.$$

Notice that $m_-(z) = \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + C^-(f(V_x - 1))$, so that by $C^-(f(V_x - 1)) = C_{V_x}f$ we get $m_-(z) = f(z)$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} m_+(z) &= \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + C^+(f(V_x - 1)) \\ &= \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} + C^-(f(V_x - 1))(z) + f(z)(V_x(z) - 1) \\ &= m_-(z) + m_-(z)(V_x - 1) = m_-(z)V_x(z). \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} C^+(f(V_x - 1)) (C^-(f(V_x - 1)))^* \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(m_+(z) - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} \right) \left(m_-(z) - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} \right)^* dz \\ &= \int_{\mathbb{R}} m_+ m_-^* dz - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_+(z) dz}{\bar{\zeta} - z} V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) - \left(\sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_-(z) dz}{\bar{\zeta} - z} V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) \right)^* \\ &\quad + \sum_{\zeta, \xi \in \mathcal{Z}} f(\zeta)V_x(\zeta)V_x^*(\xi)f^*(\xi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dz}{(\zeta - z)(\bar{\xi} - z)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.28)$$

Now, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\zeta, \xi \in \mathcal{Z}} f(\zeta) V_x(\zeta) V_x^*(\xi) f^*(\xi) \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{dz}{(\zeta - z)(\bar{\xi} - z)} = \\ & \sum_{\zeta, \xi \in \mathcal{Z}_+} f(\zeta) V_x(\zeta) V_x^*(\xi) f^*(\xi) \frac{2\pi i}{\zeta - \bar{\xi}} - \sum_{\zeta, \xi \in \mathcal{Z}_-} f(\zeta) V_x(\zeta) V_x^*(\xi) f^*(\xi) \frac{2\pi i}{\zeta - \bar{\xi}}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.29)$$

Notice that the first of the two summations adds up with

$$- \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_+(z) dz}{\bar{\zeta} - z} V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) = - \sum_{\zeta, \xi \in \mathcal{Z}_+} f(\xi) V_x(\xi) V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) \frac{2\pi i}{\bar{\zeta} - \xi}. \quad (2.30)$$

We have, by $\text{Res}(m, \bar{\zeta}) V_x^*(\zeta) = -f(\bar{\zeta}) V_x^*(\zeta) V_x^*(\zeta) = 0$,

$$\begin{aligned} & - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_-} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_+(z) dz}{\bar{\zeta} - z} V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) = - \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_-} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(m_+(z) - \frac{\text{Res}(m, \bar{\zeta})}{z - \bar{\zeta}} \right) \frac{V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta)}{\bar{\zeta} - z} dz \\ & = 2\pi i \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_-} f(\bar{\zeta}) V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) + \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_-} \sum_{\xi \in \mathcal{Z}_+ \setminus \{\bar{\zeta}\}} f(\xi) \underbrace{V_x(\xi) V_x^*(\zeta)}_0 f^*(\zeta) \frac{2\pi i}{\bar{\zeta} - \xi} \\ & = 2\pi i \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_-} f(\bar{\zeta}) V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta). \end{aligned} \quad (2.31)$$

Here we have used the fact that for all $\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}$, we have

$$\lim_{z \rightarrow \zeta} \left(m(z) - \frac{\text{Res}(m, \zeta)}{z - \zeta} \right) = C(f(V_x - 1))(\zeta) + \sum_{\zeta' \in \mathcal{Z} \setminus \{\zeta\}} \frac{f(\zeta') V_x(\zeta')}{\zeta' - \zeta} = f(\zeta).$$

We have

$$\left(- \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_-} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_-(z) dz}{\bar{\zeta} - z} V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) \right)^* = - \sum_{\zeta, \xi \in \mathcal{Z}_-} f(\xi) V_x(\xi) V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) \frac{2\pi i}{\zeta - \bar{\xi}}. \quad (2.32)$$

Notice that (2.32) adds up to the second summation in (2.29). We have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left(- \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{m_-(z) dz}{\bar{\zeta} - z} V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) \right)^* = \left(- \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_+} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left(m_-(z) - \frac{\text{Res}(m, \bar{\zeta})}{z - \bar{\zeta}} \right) \frac{V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta)}{\bar{\zeta} - z} dz \right)^* \\ & = \left(-2\pi i \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_+} f(\bar{\zeta}) V_x^*(\zeta) f^*(\zeta) \right)^* = 2\pi i \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}_+} f(\zeta) V_x(\zeta) f^*(\bar{\zeta}). \end{aligned} \quad (2.33)$$

The terms from (2.31) and (2.33) cancel out in (2.28). Then, taking into account the fact that the sum of (2.30) and (2.32) is equal to (2.29), from (2.28) and from $m_+ = m_- V_x$, we

conclude

$$0 = \int_{\mathbb{R}} m_{-}(z) V_x(z) m_{-}^{*}(z) dz + 2 \int_{\mathbb{R}} \left| \sum_{\zeta \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{f(\zeta) V_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} \right|^2 dz. \quad (2.34)$$

Since $V_x(z)$ is strictly positive, this implies $m_{-}(z) = f(z) = 0$ for $z \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f(z) V_x(z) = 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. Then we get from the second equation of the homogeneous system that $f(z) = 0$ for $z \in \mathcal{Z}$. So we have completed the proof that if f solves the homogeneous version of the system (2.26)–(2.27) then $f = 0$. $\square$

We now recall another result on the inverse scattering due to Zhou [27], which we state in Lemma 2.7 below. This result is only stated for the case of pure radiation solutions of the cubic NLS equation with $n = 0$. We need Lemma 2.7 in order to establish the fact that the map $\mathcal{G} \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(s, 0)$ is not only one-to-one but also onto.

Lemma 2.7. *Let $r \in H^s(\mathbb{R})$, $\mathcal{Z} = \emptyset$, and consider the potential u defined by the reconstruction formula (2.21). Then $u \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, for any positive κ_0 , there is a constant C such that for $\|r\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq \kappa_0$, we have $\|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|r\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$.*

Proof. We only sketch the argument, referring to references [27, 12, 10] for more information and details. We first sketch $u(x) \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}_+)$. We factorize the matrix in (2.18) writing $V_x(z) = V_{x-}^{-1} V_{x+}$, where

$$V_{x+}(z) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2ixz} r(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_{x-}(z) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{-2ixz} \overline{r}(z) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.35)$$

Set now $C_{w_x} h := C^+(h w_{x-}) + C^-(h w_{x+})$ for $w_{x\pm} := \pm(V_{x\pm} - 1)$. Then we consider a function $\mu_x \in 1 + L^2(\mathbb{R})$ such that

$$(1 - C_{w_x})(\mu_x)(z) = 1. \quad (2.36)$$

For $w_x(\zeta) := V_{x+}(\zeta) - V_{x-}(\zeta)$ we get that the $m(x, z)$ in (2.23) (in the case when all the $c_j = 0$) can be expressed also as

$$m(x, z) = 1 + \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{\mathbb{R}} \frac{\mu_x(\zeta) w_x(\zeta)}{\zeta - z} d\zeta. \quad (2.37)$$

For $x \geq 0$, by the argument in Lemma 3.4 [12] for a fixed c_s we have

$$\|C^\pm(1 - V_{x\mp}(z))\|_{L_z^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq c_s \langle x \rangle^{-s} \|r\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$$

(notice that $x \leq 0$ in Lemma 3.4 [12], because of the different definition of the operator in (2.1)). This implies immediately

$$\|C_{w_x} 1\|_{L_z^2(\mathbb{R})} \leq 2c_s \langle x \rangle^{-s} \|r\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}.$$

We consider

$$\mu_x - 1 = (1 - C_{w_x})^{-1} C_{w_x} 1$$

and correspondingly

$$\|\mu_x - 1\|_{L_z^2} \leq \|(1 - C_{w_x})^{-1}\|_{L_z^2 \rightarrow L_z^2} \|C_{w_x} 1\|_{L_z^2}.$$

We have $\|(1 - C_{w_x})^{-1}\|_{L_z^2 \rightarrow L_z^2} \leq c\langle \rho \rangle^2$ by Lemma 5.2 [10] for a fixed c , where $\rho := \|r\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$. We conclude that for $x \geq 0$ and for any κ_0 there is a constant C such that

$$\|\mu_x - 1\|_{L_z^2} \leq C\langle x \rangle^{-s} \|r\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$$

for $\rho \leq \kappa_0$. Finally, the argument in Theorem 3.5 [12] yields $\|u\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}_+)} \leq C\|r\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$.

In order to prove $u(x) \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}_-)$ we consider instead the decomposition

$$V_x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{e^{2ixz}r(z)}{1+|r(z)|^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1+|r(z)|^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{1+|r(z)|^2} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{e^{-2ixz}\bar{r}(z)}{1+|r(z)|^2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We then consider the RH problem with matrix $\tilde{V}_x := \delta_-^{\sigma_3} V_x \delta_+^{-\sigma_3}$ for $\delta(z)$ the solution of the problem (3.1) with $z_0 = +\infty$ introduced later in Proposition 3.3. Correspondingly we get estimates $\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}_-)} \leq C\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})} \leq c\|r\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R})}$ for a function $\tilde{u}$ associated to $\tilde{r} := r\delta_+\delta_-$ and for fixed c when $\rho \leq \kappa_0$, by proceeding as above. Finally, $\tilde{u} = u$. For more details see [12]. $\square$

We now discuss the representation of the solutions of the Cauchy problem (1.1) in terms of the inverse scattering transform. We recall the following result, see [15].

Theorem 2.8. *Given $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, then there exists a unique solution $u(t) \in C^0(\mathbb{R}, H^1(\mathbb{R})) \cap L_{loc}^4(\mathbb{R}, L^\infty(\mathbb{R}))$ of the integral equation (1.2).*

The solution of Theorem 2.8 is the same of Theorem 1.1.

Suppose that $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$ for fixed $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1]$. Then the solution remains in $u(t) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$, by standard arguments (see p. 1072 in [18], which can be extended to non-integer s by Lemma 2.3 in [16]). For the solution of the cubic NLS equation (1.1) with $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$, the time evolution of the scattering data is well-defined, according to the following result (see p.39 in [1]):

Lemma 2.9. *For an initial datum $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G}$ we have $u(t) \in H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R}) \cap \mathcal{G}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and the spectral data $\mathcal{S}(s, n)$ in (2.17) evolves as follows:*

$$e^{4iz^2t}r(z) \in H^s(\mathbb{R}), \quad (z_1, \dots, z_n) \in \mathbb{C}_+^n, \quad (e^{-4iz_1^2t}c_1, \dots, e^{-4iz_n^2t}c_n) \in \mathbb{C}_*^n. \quad (2.38)$$

Remark 2.10. The solution $u(t)$ is completely determined by the spectral data (2.38), because $u(t) \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$ and Lemma 2.6 holds for all $t \in \mathbb{R}$ with formulas (2.21) and (2.23).

Remark 2.11. To recover the solitons (1.3), we take the spectral data:

$$r = 0, \quad z_1 = \alpha_1 + i\beta_1 \in \mathbb{C}_+, \quad e^{-4iz_1^2t}c_1 \in \mathbb{C}_*. \quad (2.39)$$

Then, we obtain

$$u(x, t) = -2i\beta_1 e^{-2i\alpha_1 x - 4it(\alpha_1^2 - \beta_1^2) - i\psi_0} \operatorname{sech}(2\beta_1 x + 8t\alpha_1\beta_1 - \delta_0), \quad (2.40)$$

where $\delta_0 := \log\left(\frac{|c_1|}{2\beta_1}\right)$ and $\psi_0 := \arg(c_1)$. Note the correspondence: $\omega = 2\beta_1$ and $v = -2\alpha_1$, for solitons in (1.3).

Remark 2.12. In the rest of the paper we settle on the case of initial datum $u_0 \in L^{2,s}(\mathbb{R})$ with $s = 1$. It is not unreasonable to expect that all the results of this paper are true also for any $s \in (\frac{1}{2}, 1)$.

3 Dispersion for pure radiation solutions

Elements of $\mathcal{G}$ such that $\mathcal{Z}_+ = \emptyset$ generate pure radiation solutions of the cubic NLS equation. These solutions satisfy the following asymptotic behavior.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $u_0 \in \mathcal{G} \cap L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ such that $\mathcal{Z} = \emptyset$. Then there exist constants $C(u_0) > 0$ and $T(u_0) > 0$ such that the solution of the cubic NLS equation (1.1) satisfies*

$$\|u(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(u_0)|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}} \text{ for all } |t| \geq T(u_0).$$

There are furthermore constants $C_0 > 0$, $T_0 > 0$ and small $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ such that for $\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0$, we can take $C(u_0) = C_0\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})}$ and $T(u_0) = T_0$.

Remark 3.2. In [16], the result of Theorem 3.1 is proved with $L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ replaced by Σ_s for any $s > \frac{1}{2}$, only in the case of small u_0 with $\|u_0\|_{\Sigma_s} < \varepsilon_0$. In the case of the defocusing NLS equation (1.1) (that is, with $+2|u|^2u$ replaced by $-2|u|^2u$), Theorem 3.1 is proved in [13, 12]. For the focusing NLS equation (1.1), Theorem 3.1 is proved in [10]. Notice also that all these references contain proofs of the asymptotic expansions for the solution u at large t , which we do not discuss here.

In what follows, we list some of the steps for the proof of Theorem 3.1. We will follow the simplified approach discussed in [14], which involves the $\bar{\partial}$ operator, where $\bar{\partial} := \frac{1}{2}(\partial_x + i\partial_y)$. Even though Theorem 3.1 is known, in order to analyze the transformation formula (4.3) in Section 4, we will need some estimates which stem from the proof of Theorem 3.1 and which are not immediately available in the references.

3.1 Proof of Theorem 3.1

The proof starts by assuming additionally that $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Let $z_0 = \frac{x}{4t}$. First of all we consider the scalar RH problem

$$\begin{cases} \delta_+(z) = \delta_-(z)(1 + |r(z)|^2) \text{ for } z < z_0 \\ \delta_+(z) = \delta_-(z) \text{ for } z > z_0 \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

with $\delta(z)$ holomorphic in $\mathbb{C} \setminus \mathbb{R}$ and $\delta(z) \rightarrow 1$ as $z \rightarrow \infty$. The following statement is in Prop. 5.1 [10] and is elementary to prove.

Proposition 3.3. *We have*

$$\delta(z) = e^{\gamma(z)}, \quad \gamma(z) := \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{z_0} \frac{\log(1 + |r(s)|^2)}{s - z} ds.$$

For $z \not\leq z_0$ we have $\delta(z) = \overline{\delta(\bar{z})}$ and $\langle \rho \rangle^{-2} \leq |\delta(z)| \leq \langle \rho \rangle^2$ where $\rho := \|r\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$; for $\mp \operatorname{Im} z > 0$ we have $|\delta^{\pm 1}(z)| \leq 1$.

The function $\gamma(z)$ has an expansion

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma(z) &= i\nu(z_0) \log(z - z_0) + i\nu(z_0)(z - z_0) \log(z - z_0) \\ &\quad - i\nu(z_0)(z - z_0 + 1) \log(z - z_0 + 1) + \beta(z, z_0) \end{aligned}$$

where in the r.h.s. the main term is the first, and where

$$\begin{aligned} \nu(z_0) &:= -\frac{1}{2\pi} \log(1 + |r(z_0)|^2) \text{ and for } \chi(s, z_0) = \chi_{[z_0-1, z_0]}(s)(s - z_0 + 1) \\ \beta(z, z_0) &= \int_{-\infty}^{z_0} \{ \log(1 + |r(s)|^2) - \log(1 + |r(z_0)|^2) \chi(s, z_0) \} \frac{ds}{2\pi i(s - z)}. \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$\theta(z) := 2(z - z_0)^2 - 2z_0^2 \text{ with } z_0 := -\frac{x}{4t}. \quad (3.2)$$

Then we consider the RH problem (i)–(iii) with

$$v_{t,x}(z) := \begin{pmatrix} 1 + |r(z)|^2 & e^{-2it\theta} \bar{r}(z) \\ e^{2it\theta} r(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We factorize

$$v_{t,x} = \begin{cases} W_L W_R & \text{for } z > z_0 \\ U_L U_0 U_R & \text{for } z < z_0 \end{cases}$$

for

$$\begin{aligned} W_L &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{-2it\theta} \bar{r}(z) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad W_R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta} r(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{e^{2it\theta} r(z)}{1 + |r(z)|^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\ U_R &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{e^{-2it\theta} \bar{r}(z)}{1 + |r(z)|^2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + |r(z)|^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{1 + |r(z)|^2} \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

3.1.1 The model RH problem

We consider the RH problem

$$\begin{cases} P \text{ analytic in } \mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma_P \\ P(\zeta) = 1 + \frac{P_-}{\zeta} + O(\zeta^{-2}) \text{ as } \zeta \rightarrow \infty \\ P_+(\zeta) = P_-(\zeta) V_P(\zeta) \text{ in } \Sigma_P \end{cases}$$

where $\Sigma_P := \overline{\cup_{n=1}^4 \Sigma_P^n}$ with $\Sigma_P^n = e^{ni\pi/4} \mathbb{R}_+$. The matrix $V_P(\zeta)$ is defined by

$$V_P(\zeta) := \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ r_0 \zeta^{-2i\nu_0} e^{i\zeta^2/2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } \zeta \in \Sigma_P^1 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{\bar{r}_0}{1+|r_0|^2} \zeta^{2i\nu_0} e^{-i\zeta^2/2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } \zeta \in \Sigma_P^2 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{r_0}{1+|r_0|^2} \zeta^{-2i\nu_0} e^{i\zeta^2/2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } \zeta \in \Sigma_P^3 \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \bar{r}_0 \zeta^{2i\nu_0} e^{-i\zeta^2/2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } \zeta \in \Sigma_P^4 \end{cases}$$

where $r_0 = r(z_0)$ and $\nu_0 = \nu(z_0)$.

The solution of this RH problem can be worked out following word by word [13] pp.54–57. Set

$$k_1 := \frac{-i\sqrt{2\pi} e^{i\pi/4} e^{-\pi\nu_0/2}}{r_0 \Gamma(-i\nu_0)}, \quad k_2 := \frac{\nu_0}{k_1}.$$

Consider for $\text{Im } \zeta > 0$ the matrix $\Psi^+(\zeta)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{11}^+(\zeta) &= e^{-3\pi\nu_0/4} D_{i\nu_0}(e^{-3i\pi/4}\zeta), \quad \Psi_{22}^+(\zeta) = e^{\pi\nu_0/4} D_{-i\nu_0}(e^{-i\pi/4}\zeta), \\ \Psi_{12}^+(\zeta) &= e^{\pi\nu_0/4} (-ik_2)^{-1} \left(\partial_\zeta(D_{-i\nu_0}(e^{-i\pi/4}\zeta)) - \frac{i\zeta}{2} D_{-i\nu_0}(e^{-i\pi/4}\zeta) \right), \\ \Psi_{21}^+(\zeta) &= e^{-3\pi\nu_0/4} (ik_1)^{-1} \left(\partial_\zeta(D_{i\nu_0}(e^{-i3\pi/4}\zeta)) + \frac{i\zeta}{2} D_{i\nu_0}(e^{-i3\pi/4}\zeta) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Consider for $\text{Im } \zeta < 0$ the matrix $\Psi^-(\zeta)$ with

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{11}^-(\zeta) &= e^{\pi\nu_0/4} D_{i\nu_0}(e^{i\pi/4}\zeta), \quad \Psi_{22}^-(\zeta) = e^{-3\pi\nu_0/4} D_{i\nu_0}(e^{3i\pi/4}\zeta), \\ \Psi_{12}^-(\zeta) &= e^{-3\pi\nu_0/4} (-ik_2)^{-1} \left(\partial_\zeta(D_{-i\nu_0}(e^{i3\pi/4}\zeta)) - \frac{i\zeta}{2} D_{-i\nu_0}(e^{i3\pi/4}\zeta) \right), \\ \Psi_{21}^-(\zeta) &= e^{\pi\nu_0/4} (ik_1)^{-1} \left(\partial_\zeta(D_{i\nu_0}(e^{i\pi/4}\zeta)) + \frac{i\zeta}{2} D_{i\nu_0}(e^{i\pi/4}\zeta) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Here $D_a(\zeta)$ is the unique entire function solving

$$\frac{d^2}{d\zeta^2} D_a(\zeta) + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\zeta^2}{4} + a \right) D_a(\zeta) = 0$$

that for $|\arg(\zeta)| < 3\pi/4$ satisfies

$$D_a(\zeta) \sim e^{-\zeta^2/4} \zeta^a \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-1)^n 2^n \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n \left(\frac{a}{2} - (j-1) \right) \left(\frac{a}{2} - (j-1/2) \right)}{n! \zeta^{2n}} \right)$$

and such that $D'_a(\zeta) + \frac{\zeta}{2} D_a(\zeta) = a D_{a-1}(\zeta)$, (3.4)

see Chapter 16 [26]. If we introduce the angular sectors

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_1 &= \{\zeta : \arg \zeta \in (0, \pi/4)\}, & \Omega_2 &= \{\zeta : \arg \zeta \in (\pi/4, 3\pi/4)\}, \\ \Omega_3 &= \{\zeta : \arg \zeta \in (3\pi/4, \pi)\}, & \Omega_4 &= \{\zeta : \arg \zeta \in (\pi, 5\pi/4)\}, \\ \Omega_5 &= \{\zeta : \arg \zeta \in (\pi + 5\pi/4, 7\pi/4)\}, & \Omega_6 &= \{\zeta : \arg \zeta \in (7\pi/4, 2\pi)\},\end{aligned}$$

then, following [13], see also [14], we have

$$\begin{aligned}P(\zeta) &= \Psi^+(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ r_0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } \zeta \in \Omega_1, \\ P(\zeta) &= \Psi^+(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} \text{ for } \zeta \in \Omega_2, \\ P(\zeta) &= \Psi^+(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{\bar{r}_0}{1+|r_0|^2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } \zeta \in \Omega_3, \\ P(\zeta) &= \Psi^-(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ \frac{r_0}{1+|r_0|^2} & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } \zeta \in \Omega_4, \\ P(\zeta) &= \Psi^-(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} \text{ for } \zeta \in \Omega_5, \\ P(\zeta) &= \Psi^-(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \bar{r}_0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ for } \zeta \in \Omega_6.\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

By (3.5) and (3.4), see [13], we have in each of the above sectors

$$\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} \Psi^\pm(\zeta) \zeta^{-i\nu_0\sigma_3} e^{i\zeta^2\sigma_3/4} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k_1 \\ k_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

so that $\lim_{\zeta \rightarrow \infty} \zeta(P(\zeta) - 1) = P_1$, with

$$\begin{aligned}P_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k_1 \\ k_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_5, & P_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} r_0 k_1 & k_1 \\ k_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_1, \\ P_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k_1 \\ k_2 & \frac{\bar{r}_0 k_2}{1+|r_0|^2} \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_3, & P_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} \frac{r_0 k_1}{1+|r_0|^2} & k_1 \\ k_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_4, \\ P_1 &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & k_1 \\ k_2 & \bar{r}_0 k_2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_6.\end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

In each sector we have $\det P(\zeta) = 1$, see p.54 [13].

With respect to the analysis in [13] we need to add few more remarks of quantitative nature on $P(\zeta)$. First of all, by $|r(z_0)|^2 \leq 2\|r\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}\|r\|_{\dot{H}^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C(u_0)$ there is a $C(u_0)$ such that $|k_1| + |k_2| \leq C(u_0)$. Furthermore the following is true.

Lemma 3.4. *Let $\rho = \|r\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$. For any ρ_0 there exists a C such that for $\rho \leq \rho_0$ we have*

$$|P(\zeta)| \leq C \text{ for all } \zeta \notin \mathbb{R} \text{ and} \tag{3.7}$$

$$|P(\zeta) - 1 - P_1/\zeta| \leq C \rho |\zeta|^{-2} \text{ if also } |\zeta| \geq 1. \tag{3.8}$$

Proof. We focus only on (3.8), since (3.7) follows by (3.8) and by the fact that $D_a(\zeta)$ is an entire function in (a, ζ) . The proof of (3.8) is based on formulas for $D_{i\nu_0}(\zeta)$ for which we refer to Chapter 16 [26].

Recall that $D_{i\nu_0}(\zeta) = 2^{\frac{i\nu_0}{2} + \frac{1}{4}} \zeta^{-\frac{1}{2}} W_{\frac{i\nu_0}{2} + \frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}}(\frac{\zeta^2}{2})$, where for $|\arg(z)| < 3\pi/2$ we have

$$W_{\frac{i\nu_0}{2} + \frac{1}{4}, -\frac{1}{4}}(z) = e^{-z/2} z^{\frac{i\nu_0}{2} + \frac{1}{4}} \left[1 - z^{-1} \frac{\Gamma\left(\frac{3}{2} - i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(1 - i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right)}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} - i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(-i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right)} + \frac{1}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{2} - i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(-i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right)} \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-i\infty - \frac{3}{2}}^{+i\infty - \frac{3}{2}} z^s \Gamma(s) \Gamma\left(-s + \frac{1}{2} - i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right) \Gamma\left(-s - i\frac{\nu_0}{2}\right) ds \right].$$

To bound the integral we use:

$$|z^s| = |z|^{\operatorname{Re}(s)} e^{-t \arg(z)} \text{ for } s = \operatorname{Re}(s) + it;$$

$$|\Gamma(z)| \leq \sqrt{2\pi} |z|^{z-\frac{1}{2}} |e^{\frac{K}{\operatorname{Re}(z)}}| \text{ for } \operatorname{Re} z > 0 \text{ and for } K > 0 \text{ the constant in p. 249 [26];}$$

$$\Gamma(s) = \frac{\Gamma(s+2)}{s(s+1)}.$$

Then the absolute value of the integral is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & C_1 |z|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-t \arg(z)} e^{-t \arg(\frac{1}{2} + it)} \left| \frac{3}{2} - it \right|^{-1} \left| \frac{1}{2} - it \right|^{-1} \times \\ & \quad \times e^{(t + \frac{\nu_0}{2}) \arg(2 - i(t + \frac{\nu_0}{2}))} \left| 2 - i \left(t + \frac{\nu_0}{2} \right) \right|^{\frac{3}{2}} e^{(t + \frac{\nu_0}{2}) \arg(\frac{3}{2} - i(t + \frac{\nu_0}{2}))} \left| \frac{3}{2} - i \left(t + \frac{\nu_0}{2} \right) \right| dt \\ & \leq C_2 |z|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} e^{-t \arg(z) - |t| \frac{3}{2} \pi} \langle t \rangle^{\frac{1}{2}} dt \leq C_3 |z|^{-\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{3}{2} \pi - |\arg(z)| \right)^{-\frac{3}{2}} \end{aligned}$$

for fixed constants which depend on ρ_0 and for $|\arg(z)| < \frac{3}{2}\pi$. This and the identity (3.4) yield inequality (3.8) if ζ is outside a union of preassigned small cones containing Σ_P . Near the cones we can proceed by estimating similarly the r.h.s.'s of the identities

$$\begin{aligned} D_{i\nu_0}(\zeta) &= e^{-\nu_0\pi} D_{i\nu_0}(-\zeta) + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\Gamma(-i\nu_0)} e^{\frac{i}{2}(\nu_0+1)\pi} D_{-i\nu_0-1}(-i\zeta), \\ D_{i\nu_0}(\zeta) &= e^{\nu_0\pi} D_{i\nu_0}(-\zeta) + \frac{\sqrt{2\pi}}{\Gamma(-i\nu_0)} e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\nu_0+1)\pi} D_{-i\nu_0-1}(i\zeta). \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof of Lemma 3.4. $\square$

3.1.2 The $\bar{\partial}$ argument of [14]

Dieng and McLaughlin [14] have a simpler discussion than in [13, 12, 10] as to how to localize the RH to the model RH problem. For this reason we choose to follow the discussion in [14],

going briefly through the argument in order to point out a detail, see Lemma 3.8, which will be useful in the proof of Theorem 1.3.

The first step is the following proposition. For the proof, we refer to [14].

Proposition 3.5. *Set $\widehat{r}_0 = r(z_0)e^{-2i\nu(z_0)-2\beta(z_0, z_0)}$. Fix $\lambda_0 > 0$ and assume $\|r\|_{H^1} < \lambda_0$. Then there exist functions R_j defined in $\overline{\Omega}_j$ for $j = 1, 3, 4, 6$ and a constant c such that the following properties hold:*

$$\begin{cases} R_1(z) = r(z) \text{ for } z - z_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ R_1(z) = \widehat{r}_0(z - z_0)^{-i\nu(z_0)}\delta^2 \text{ for } z - z_0 \in e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}}\mathbb{R}_+, \\ |\bar{\partial}R_1(z)| \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}|z - z_0|^{-1/2} + c|r'(\operatorname{Re} z)| \text{ for all } z \in \Omega_1 + z_0; \\ \\ R_3(z) = \frac{\bar{r}(z)}{1+|r(z)|^2} \text{ for } z - z_0 \in \mathbb{R}_-, \\ R_3(z) = \frac{\widehat{\bar{r}}_0}{1+|r(z_0)|^2}(z - z_0)^{i\nu(z_0)}\delta^{-2} \text{ for } z - z_0 \in e^{3i\frac{\pi}{4}}\mathbb{R}_+, \\ |\bar{\partial}R_3(z)| \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}|z - z_0|^{-1/2} + c|r'(\operatorname{Re} z)| \text{ for all } z \in \Omega_3 + z_0; \\ \\ R_4(z) = \frac{r(z)}{1+|r(z)|^2} \text{ for } z - z_0 \in \mathbb{R}_-, \\ R_4(z) = \frac{\widehat{r}_0}{1+|r(z_0)|^2}(z - z_0)^{-i\nu(z_0)}\delta^2 \text{ for } z - z_0 \in e^{5i\frac{\pi}{4}}\mathbb{R}_+, \\ |\bar{\partial}R_4(z)| \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}|z - z_0|^{-1/2} + c|r'(\operatorname{Re} z)| \text{ for all } z \in \Omega_4 + z_0; \\ \\ R_6(z) = \bar{r}(z) \text{ for } z - z_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \\ R_6(z) = \widehat{\bar{r}}_0(z - z_0)^{-i\nu(z_0)}\delta^{-2} \text{ for } z - z_0 \in e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}}\mathbb{R}_+, \\ |\bar{\partial}R_6(z)| \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}|z - z_0|^{-1/2} + c|r'(\operatorname{Re} z)| \text{ for all } z \in \Omega_6 + z_0. \end{cases}$$

Note that the functions $R_j(z)$ can be defined explicitly. For $j = 1, 3$ in particular, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_1(z) &= \cos(2\arg(z - z_0))r(\operatorname{Re} z) \\ &\quad + (1 - \cos(2\arg(z - z_0)))\widehat{r}_0(z - z_0)^{-i\nu(z_0)}\delta^2(z), \\ R_3(z) &= \cos(2(\arg(z - z_0) - \pi))\frac{\bar{r}(\operatorname{Re} z)}{1 + |r(\operatorname{Re} z)|^2} \\ &\quad + (1 - \cos(2(\arg(z - z_0) - \pi)))\frac{\widehat{\bar{r}}_0}{1 + |r(z_0)|^2}(z - z_0)^{i\nu(z_0)}\delta^{-2}(z). \end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

We now extend as follows the matrices in (3.3):

$$\begin{aligned} W_R &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta}R_1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_1 + z_0, \quad U_R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{-2it\theta}R_3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_3 + z_0, \\ U_L &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta}R_4 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_4 + z_0, \quad W_L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{-2it\theta}R_6 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ in } \Omega_6 + z_0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

We set

$$A := \begin{cases} mW_R^{-1} \text{ in } \Omega_1 + z_0, \\ m \text{ in } (\Omega_2 \cup \Omega_5) + z_0, \\ mU_R^{-1} \text{ in } \Omega_3 + z_0, \\ mU_L \text{ in } \Omega_4 + z_0, \\ mW_L \text{ in } \Omega_6 + z_0. \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

We set $B := A\delta^{-\sigma_3}$, obtaining a new function with jump relations $B_+(z) = B_-(z)V_B(z)$ with jump matrix defined by

$$V_B(z) := \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta} R_1(z) \delta^{-2}(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } z \in z_0 + e^{i\pi/4} \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{-2it\theta} R_3(z) \delta^{-2}(z) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } z \in z_0 + e^{3i\pi/4} \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta} R_4(z) \delta^{-2}(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } z \in z_0 + e^{5i\pi/4} \mathbb{R}_+, \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{-2it\theta} R_6(z) \delta^2(z) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} & \text{for } z \in z_0 + e^{-i\pi/4} \mathbb{R}_+. \end{cases}$$

Set now $E(z) := B(z)P^{-1}(\sqrt{8t}(z - z_0))$. By construction the jump matrices of $B(z)$ and of $P(\sqrt{8t}(z - z_0))$ coincide, so that $E(z)$ does not have jump discontinuities. We can use $B(z) = E(z)P(\sqrt{8t}(z - z_0))$ to define $B(z)$, for $E(z)$ defined by the following proposition.

Proposition 3.6. *Fix $\lambda_0 > 0$ and assume $\|r\|_{H^1} < \lambda_0$. Then there exist constants T and c such that for $t \geq T$ there exists a $E(z)$ continuous in $\mathbb{C}$ and satisfying the following additional properties:*

- $E(z) \rightarrow 1$ for $z \rightarrow \infty$ and more specifically

$$\begin{aligned} E(z) &= 1 + \frac{E_1}{z} + O(z^{-2}) \\ |E_1| &\leq c\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}} t^{-\frac{3}{4}} \text{ for } t \geq T; \end{aligned} \tag{3.12}$$

- E solves the system $\bar{\partial}E = EW$ with, for $\zeta = \sqrt{8t}(z - z_0)$,

$$W(z) := \begin{cases} P(\zeta) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta} \delta^{-2}(z) \bar{\partial} R_1(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1}(\zeta) & \text{for } z \in \Omega_1, \\ P(\zeta) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{-2it\theta} \delta^{-2}(z) \bar{\partial} R_3(z) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1}(\zeta) & \text{for } z \in \Omega_3, \\ P(\zeta) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ e^{2it\theta} \delta^{-2}(z) \bar{\partial} R_4(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1}(\zeta) & \text{for } z \in \Omega_4, \\ P(\zeta) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -e^{-2it\theta} \delta^2(z) \bar{\partial} R_6(z) \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} P^{-1}(\zeta) & \text{for } z \in \Omega_6, \\ 0 & \text{for } z \in \Omega_2 \cup \Omega_5. \end{cases}$$

The proof of Prop. 3.6 is in Sections 2.4 and 2.5 [14] and involves the following equation:

$$(1 - J)E = 1 \text{ where } JE := \frac{1}{\pi} \int_{\mathbb{C}} \frac{EW}{\zeta - z} dA(\zeta). \tag{3.13}$$

In Proposition 2.2 [14] it is proved that $\|JH\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-1/4} \|H\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})}$.

The estimate in Proposition 2.2 [14] is obtained by estimating separately for each Ω_j with $j \in I := 1, 3, 4, 6$ and for $\zeta - z_0 = u + iv$

$$|JH(z)| \leq c_1 \|H\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \sum_{j \in I} (I_1(z, j) + I_2(z, j)), \quad (3.14)$$

$$I_1(z, j) := \int_{\Omega_j} \frac{|r'(u)|e^{-t|uv|}}{|\zeta - z|} dudv, I_2(z, j) := \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \int_{\Omega_j} \frac{|\zeta - z_0|^{-1/2} e^{-t|uv|}}{|\zeta - z|} dudv$$

and by proving separately $|I_l(z, j)| \leq c_2 \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-1/4}$ for all $j \in I$ and $l = 1, 2$. Furthermore, if we drop the denominator $|\zeta - z|$, in Sect. 2.5 [14] it is shown that the upper bound becomes $c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-3/4}$ for a fixed c if $\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} < \lambda_0$ with $\lambda_0 > 0$ fixed.

As a consequence of the estimates stated after (3.13), there exists then a $T(\lambda_0) > 0$ such that (3.12) is true, the operator in (3.13) is invertible and we have $\|J\|_{\infty \rightarrow \infty} \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-1/4}$ for $t \geq T(\lambda_0)$.

Proposition 3.6 yields Theorem 3.1 by observing that in $\Omega_3 + z_0$ we have $m(t, x, z) = E(z)P(\sqrt{8t}(z - z_0))\delta^{\sigma_3}(z)$ with

$$m(z) = 1 + \frac{m_1}{z} + O(z^{-2}) \text{ with } m_1 = E_1 + \frac{P_1}{\sqrt{8t}} + \begin{pmatrix} \delta_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\delta_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

where by (2.21) and Proposition 3.6 for $t \geq T(\lambda_0)$ and a fixed $C = C(\lambda_0)$ we have

$$|u(t, x) - 2i \frac{k_1}{\sqrt{8t}}| \leq C|t|^{-\frac{3}{4}} \text{ and } |u(t, x)| \leq C|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Obviously, by the time reversibility of the (1.1), the same estimates hold true also for all $t \leq -T(\lambda_0)$. This proves Theorem 3.1 for $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$.

Consider $u_0 \in L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ but $u_0 \notin H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Let $u(t)$ the solution, provided by Theorem 1.1, of the corresponding Cauchy problem (1.1). We consider a sequence $u_{0,n} \in L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R})$ such that $u_{0,n} \rightarrow u_0$ in $L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$. Then for the reflection coefficients we have $r_n \rightarrow r$ in H^1 .

We can assume $\|r_n\|_{H^1} \leq 2\|r\|_{H^1}$ for all n . By the discussion developed so far, there is a fixed C , which depends only on λ_0 , where $\lambda_0 \geq \|r\|_{H^1}$, such that for $|t| \geq T(\lambda_0)$ we have $|u_n(t, x)| \leq C|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for almost any x . By Theorem 1.1 we known that for any t we have $u_n(t) \rightarrow u(t)$ in $L^2(\mathbb{R})$. This implies that for almost any x we have $u_n(t, x) \rightarrow u(t, x)$. In turn, we can conclude that $|u(t, x)| \leq C|t|^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ for almost any x . This completes the proof of the statement in Theorem 3.1 also in the case when $u_0 \in L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ but $u_0 \notin H^1(\mathbb{R})$.

3.1.3 Several remarks

By Proposition 3.6 we draw a sharp estimate $\|E - 1\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \leq Ct^{-1/4}$. However, we have the following lemma.

Lemma 3.7. *Let $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Assume $\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0$. Then there are a $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, a $c > 0$ and a $T > 0$ such that*

$$|1 - E(z_1)| \leq ct^{-3/4} \|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} \text{ for } t \geq T. \quad (3.15)$$

Proof. By (3.14) we have

$$|1 - E(z_1)| \leq c_1 \|E\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{C})} \sum_{j \in I} (I_1(z_1, j) + I_2(z_1, j)).$$

By Lemma 3.8 below we have $|I_l(z_1, j)| \leq c \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-3/4}$ for $c = c(\text{Im } z_1)$. There is a $C > 0$, simply the Lipschitz constant of the direct scattering map near $u_0 = 0$, such that for $\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0$ we have $\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C \|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})}$. This yields Lemma 3.7. $\square$

Lemma 3.8. *Let $z_1 \in \mathbb{C}_+$. Then there are a $\varepsilon_0 > 0$, a $c = c(\text{Im } z_1, \varepsilon_0)$ and a $T > 0$ such that for $\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0$ we have $|I_l(z_1, j)| \leq c \|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} t^{-3/4}$ for $t \geq T$.*

Proof. Let $z_1 = x_1 + iy_1$. For definiteness we consider only the case $j = 1$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} I_1(z_1, 1) &\leq I_{11} + I_{12} \\ I_{11} &:= \int_0^{y_1/2} dv \int_v^\infty \frac{|r'(u)| e^{-tuv}}{\sqrt{(u + x/t - x_1)^2 + (v - y_1)^2}} du \\ I_{12} &:= \int_{y_1/2}^\infty dv e^{-tv^2} \int_v^\infty \frac{|r'(u)|}{\sqrt{(u + x/t - x_1)^2 + (v - y_1)^2}} du. \end{aligned}$$

Then, for a fixed κ we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{11} &\leq \frac{2}{y_1} \int_0^\infty dv \int_v^\infty |r'(u)| e^{-tuv} du \leq \frac{2}{y_1} \|r'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \int_0^\infty dv \left(\int_v^\infty e^{-2tuv} du \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &\leq \frac{\sqrt{2}}{y_1 \sqrt{t}} \|r'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})} \int_0^\infty dv e^{-tv^2} v^{-\frac{1}{2}} \leq \kappa t^{-\frac{3}{4}} (\text{Im } z_1)^{-1} \|r'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})}. \end{aligned}$$

We have

$$I_{12} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{8}ty_1^2} \int_{y_1/2}^\infty dv e^{-\frac{1}{2}tv^2} \int_v^\infty \frac{|r'(u)|}{|\zeta - z_1|} du \leq c e^{-\frac{1}{8}ty_1^2} \|r'\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R})},$$

where the last inequality is proved in the proof of Prop. 2.2 [14].

A similar decomposition remains determined for $I_2(z_1, 1)$, recalling that $z_0 = -\frac{x}{4t}$:

$$\begin{aligned} I_2(z_1, 1) &\leq I_{21} + I_{22} \\ I_{21} &:= \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \int_0^{y_1/2} dv \int_v^\infty \frac{|\zeta - z_0|^{-1/2} e^{-tuv}}{\sqrt{(u - x/t - x_1)^2 + (v - y_1)^2}} du \\ I_{22} &:= \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \int_{y_1/2}^\infty dv e^{-tv^2} \int_v^\infty \frac{|\zeta - z_0|^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{(u - x/t - x_1)^2 + (v - y_1)^2}} du. \end{aligned}$$

Then, by Sect. 2.5 [14], for a fixed κ_p and where $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$ with $2 < p < 4$, we get

$$\begin{aligned} I_{21} &\leq \frac{2\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}}{y_1} \int_0^{y_1/2} dv \int_v^\infty |\zeta - z_0|^{-1/2} e^{-tuv} du \\ &\leq \frac{2\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}}{y_1} \int_0^{y_1/2} dv v^{\frac{1}{p}-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\int_1^\infty \frac{dw}{(w^2+1)^{\frac{p}{2}}} dw \right)^{\frac{1}{p}} \left(\int_v^\infty e^{-tuvq} du \right)^{\frac{1}{q}} \\ &\leq \kappa_p t^{-\frac{3}{4}} (\operatorname{Im} z_1)^{-1} \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}, \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality is in Sect. 2.5 [14]. We have

$$I_{22} \leq e^{-\frac{1}{8}ty_1^2} \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \int_{y_1/2}^\infty dv e^{-\frac{1}{2}tv^2} \int_v^\infty \frac{|\zeta - z_0|^{-1/2}}{|\zeta - z|} du \leq ce^{-\frac{1}{8}ty_1^2} t^{-1/4} \|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})},$$

where the last inequality is proved in the proof of Prop. 2.2 [14].

We then get $|I_l(z_1, j)| \leq c\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-3/4}$ for $j = 1$. For the other j 's the argument is similar. $\square$

Lemma 3.9. *Fix $z_1 = \alpha_1 + i\beta_1$ with $\beta_1 > 0$. There is ε_0 sufficiently small such that for $\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0$ there is a constant C such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |1 - W_R(z_1)| &\leq Ce^{-t8\beta_1^2} \|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} \text{ if } z_1 \in \Omega_1 + z_0 \\ |1 - U_R^{-1}(z_1)| &\leq Ce^{-t8\beta_1^2} \|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} \text{ if } z_1 \in \Omega_3 + z_0. \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

Proof. By (3.9) we have that $\|R_j\|_{L^\infty(\Omega_j+z_0)} \leq C'\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|u_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})}$ for $j = 1, 3$. If $z_1 \in \Omega_1 + z_0$ we have $\alpha_1 + \frac{x}{4t} \geq \beta_1$ and so $|e^{-2it\theta}| \leq e^{-8t(\alpha_1 + \frac{x}{4t})\beta_1} \leq e^{-t8\beta_1^2}$. If $z_1 \in \Omega_3 + z_0$ we have similarly $|e^{2it\theta}| \leq e^{-t8\beta_1^2}$. This yields (3.16). $\square$

Lemma 3.10. *Fix $z_1 = \alpha_1 + i\beta_1$ with $\beta_1 > 0$. Fix $\rho_0 > 0$. Let $\rho := \|r\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$ and assume $\rho < \rho_0$. Then there exists a constant C independent from z_0 such that*

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta(z_1) - \Delta(z_1)| &\leq C\|r\|_{L^2}^2 \\ \text{where } \Delta(z_1) &:= \exp\left(\frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_1} \frac{\log(1 + |r(s)|^2)}{s - z_1} ds\right). \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

Fix $K > 0$. Then for $|z_0 - \alpha_1| \leq K/\sqrt{t}$ there exists a constant C such that

$$|\delta(z_1) - \Delta(z_1)| \leq \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}\beta_1} \log(1 + \rho^2). \quad (3.18)$$

Proof. By Proposition 3.3, we have for a fixed c

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \gamma(z_1) - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_1} \frac{\log(1 + |r(s)|^2)}{s - z_1} ds \right| &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \int_{\alpha_1}^{z_0} \frac{\log(1 + |r(s)|^2)}{s - \alpha_1 - i\beta_1} ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{c}{\beta_1} \|r\|_{L^2}^2. \end{aligned}$$

This yields (3.17) since the bound $|\delta(z)| \leq (1 + \rho^2)$ is independent from z_0 . Similarly (3.18) follows from

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \gamma(z_1) - \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{-\infty}^{\alpha_1} \frac{\log(1 + |r(s)|^2)}{s - z_1} ds \right| &= \frac{1}{2\pi} \left| \int_{\alpha_1}^{z_0} \frac{\log(1 + |r(s)|^2)}{s - \alpha_1 - i\beta_1} ds \right| \\ &\leq \frac{|z_0 - \alpha_1|}{\beta_1} \log(1 + \rho^2). \end{aligned}$$

These yield Lemma 3.10. $\square$

We will use the inequalities in Sect. 3.1.3 for the proof of Theorem 1.3. Notice that similar inequalities are also in Lemmas 5.18–5.21 [10].

4 Proof of Theorem 1.3

Let $\mathcal{G}_0$ be the subset of $\mathcal{G}$ formed by pure radiation solutions of the cubic NLS equation and $\mathcal{G}_1$ be the subset of $\mathcal{G}$ formed by the solutions with $\sharp\mathcal{Z}_+(u) = 1$, where $\mathcal{G} \subset L^1(\mathbb{R})$ is an open dense set of generic potentials with constant $\sharp\mathcal{Z}_+(u)$. Recall from Remarks 2.2 and 2.11 that solitons (1.3) belong to $\mathcal{G}_1$. This means that if the value of $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ in the bound (1.4) is small enough, then the initial datum u_0 belongs to $\mathcal{G}_1$. Notice also that the positive constant ε_0 can be taken independent of (γ_0, x_0) . Indeed, when we replace $u_0(x)$ with $u_0(x - x_0)$, their scattering function $a(z)$ is the same, while $e^{i\gamma_0}u_0(x)$ describes a compact set in $L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ as γ_0 varies in $\mathbb{R}$.

We consider now an initial datum u_0 satisfying the bound (1.4). The scattering datum associated with the initial datum u_0 , which by Lemma 2.1 and Remark 2.11 belongs to the space $\mathcal{S}(1, 1)$ defined in (2.17), is close to those of the soliton $\varphi_{\omega_0, \gamma_0, v_0}(0, x - x_0)$ by Lemmas 2.1 and 2.4. By Lemma 2.4, we know that $u_0 \in L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ implies $r \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$. Furthermore, by the Lipschitz continuity of $u_0 \rightarrow r$ and the fact that the soliton has $r \equiv 0$, we have $\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\epsilon$, with $C = C(\omega_0, v_0)$ and the value of ϵ is given in (1.4).

We define now a map

$$\mathcal{G}_1 \times \mathbb{C}_+ \times \mathbb{C}_* \ni (u_0, z_1, c_1) \mapsto \tilde{u}_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0 \quad (4.1)$$

by means of the transformation

$$\tilde{r}(z) := r(z) \frac{z - z_1}{z - \bar{z}_1}. \quad (4.2)$$

By its definition, $\tilde{r} \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ if $r \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$ and there is $C > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|r\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$. We then define $\tilde{u}_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0 \cap L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ by the reconstruction formula (2.21), after the corresponding RH problem (i)–(iii) is solved for the scattering datum in $\mathcal{S}(1, 0) = \{\tilde{r} \in H^1(\mathbb{R})\}$, see (2.17). By Lemma 2.7, we know that $\tilde{u}_0 \in \mathcal{G}_0 \cap L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ with norm $\|\tilde{u}_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\epsilon$.

We now assume also that $u_0 \in H^1(\mathbb{R})$, to define the time evolution of the scattering data in $\mathcal{S}(1, 1)$ and $\mathcal{S}(1, 0)$. Let $\tilde{u}(t) \in \mathcal{G}_0 \cap L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R})$ be the solution of the cubic

NLS equation with the initial datum $\tilde{u}_0$, whereas $u(t) \in \mathcal{G}_1 \cap L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R}) \cap H^1(\mathbb{R})$ is the solution of the cubic NLS equation with the initial datum u_0 .

Denote the solution of the RH problem (i)–(iv) associated to $\tilde{u}(t)$ by $m(t, x, z)$. The two solutions $u(t)$ and $\tilde{u}(t)$ are related by the auto-Bäcklund transformation formula, which we state now.

Lemma 4.1. *We have*

$$u(t, x) = \tilde{u}(t, x) + \mathbf{B}, \quad \mathbf{B} := 4 \operatorname{Im}(z_1) \frac{\mathbf{b}_1 \bar{\mathbf{b}}_2}{|\mathbf{b}_1|^2 + |\mathbf{b}_2|^2}, \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\mathbf{b}_1 := e^{-i x z_1} m_{11}(t, x, z_1) - \frac{c_1 m_{12}(t, x, z_1) e^{i x z_1 + 4 i t z_1^2}}{2i \operatorname{Im}(z_1)}, \quad (4.4)$$

$$\mathbf{b}_2 := e^{-i x z_1} m_{21}(t, x, z_1) - \frac{c_1 m_{22}(t, x, z_1) e^{i x z_1 + 4 i t z_1^2}}{2i \operatorname{Im}(z_1)}. \quad (4.5)$$

Proof. Note that $(\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)^T$ is a solution of the spectral system (2.1), and hence the transformation formula (4.3) is a particular example of the general auto-Bäcklund transformation formula used in [19] (after the transformation $\tilde{u} \rightarrow -\tilde{u}$ and $\mathbf{b}_2 \rightarrow -\mathbf{b}_2$, which leaves (2.1) invariant). The particular expressions (4.4)–(4.5) were used in [10] and we give a sketch of the proof of this transformation formula from Appendix A in [10].

We denote by m (resp. $\mathbf{m}$) the solution of the RH problem (i)–(iv) associated to $\tilde{u}$ (resp. u). We set $\psi = m e^{-i \sigma_3 x z}$. Then consider the function $\hat{\psi}(x, z)$

$$\hat{\psi}(x, z) := \mathbf{a}(x) \mu(z) \mathbf{a}^{-1}(x) \psi(x, z) \mu^{-1}(z),$$

where

$$\mu(z) := \begin{pmatrix} z - z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & z - \bar{z}_1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and $\mathbf{a} = [\mathbf{a}_1, \mathbf{a}_2]$ with

$$\mathbf{a}_1(x) := \psi(x, z_1) \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ \frac{-c_1}{z_1 - \bar{z}_1} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{a}_2(x) := \psi(x, z_1) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-\bar{c}_1}{z_1 - \bar{z}_1} \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

By symmetries of the spectral system (2.1) we have $\mathbf{a}_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \bar{\mathbf{a}}_1$. Notice that $\mathbf{a}_1 = (\mathbf{b}_1, \mathbf{b}_2)^T$ is given by (4.4) and (4.5).

The function $\hat{\psi}(x, z)$ has poles only at z_1 and $\bar{z}_1$ and $\hat{m}(x, z) = \hat{\psi}(x, z) e^{i \sigma_3 x z}$ satisfies (2.19)–(2.20) for $k = 1$. Furthermore, $\hat{m}(x, z)$ satisfies (i)–(iv) of the RH problem involving $\hat{V}_x(z) = e^{-i \sigma_3 x z} (z) \hat{V}(z) e^{i \sigma_3 x z}$ with

$$\hat{V}(z) = \hat{\psi}_-^{-1}(x, z) \hat{\psi}_+(x, z) = \mu(z) \psi_-^{-1}(x, z) \psi_+(x, z) \mu^{-1}(z) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + |\hat{r}(z)|^2 & \overline{\hat{r}(z)} \\ \hat{r}(z) & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

where

$$\widehat{r}(z) := r(z) \frac{z - \bar{z}_1}{z - z_1}.$$

All these formulas are in [10], with a different notation (our reflection coefficient $r(z)$ is equivalent to $\bar{r}(z)$ in [10], whereas our z is $-z/2$ in [10]). It is clear by the uniqueness of the inverse problem that $\mathbf{m} = \widehat{m}$.

We have expansions $\mathbf{m}(x, z) = 1 + \frac{\mathbf{m}_1(x)}{z} + o(z^{-1})$ and $m(x, z) = 1 + \frac{m_1(x)}{z} + o(z^{-1})$. By an elementary computation, we have $\mathbf{m}_1 = m_1 - \mathbf{a}\mu_1\mathbf{a} + \mu_1$, where

$$\mu_1 := \begin{pmatrix} z_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \bar{z}_1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Therefore, the reconstruction formula (2.21) yields

$$u = \mathbf{i}[\sigma_3, \mathbf{m}_1]_{12} = \mathbf{i}[\sigma_3, m_1 - \mathbf{a}\mu_1\mathbf{a}]_{12},$$

which proves (4.3). $\square$

Remark 4.2. The soliton in Remark 2.11 is obtained for $\tilde{u} = 0$ and $m(x, z) = I$, when

$$\mathbf{b}_1 = e^{-\mathbf{i}xz_1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbf{b}_2 = -\frac{c_1}{2\mathbf{i}\operatorname{Im}(z_1)} e^{\mathbf{i}xz_1 + 4\mathbf{i}tz_1^2}.$$

By Theorem 3.1, we know that there exist constants $C_0 > 0$ and $T > 0$ such that for all $|t| \geq T$, we have

$$\|\tilde{u}(t, \cdot)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq C_0 \epsilon |t|^{-\frac{1}{2}},$$

since there is a constant $C > 0$ such that $\|\tilde{u}_0\|_{L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\epsilon$.

To prove Theorem 1.3 we need to focus only on $\mathbf{B}$. From the proof, we will see that the (ω_1, v_1) of the statement of Theorem 1.3 are those of the soliton with spectral data (z_1, c_1) .

We will consider only positive times, focusing on $t \gg 1$. We know that

$$m(t, x, z_1) = \begin{cases} E(z_1)P(\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0))\delta^{\sigma_3}(z_1)W_R(z_1) & \text{if } z_1 \in \Omega_1 + z_0, \\ E(z_1)P(\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0))\delta^{\sigma_3}(z_1) & \text{if } z_1 \in \Omega_2 + z_0, \\ E(z_1)P(\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0))\delta^{\sigma_3}(z_1)U_R^{-1}(z_1) & \text{if } z_1 \in \Omega_3 + z_0. \end{cases} \quad (4.6)$$

We have the following estimate.

Lemma 4.3. *Fix $\lambda_0 > 0$. Then there is a $C > 0$ and a $T > 0$ such that for $\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} < \lambda_0$ we have for $t \geq T$*

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{11}(t, x, z_1) - \delta(z_1)| + |m_{22}(t, x, z_1) - \delta^{-1}(z_1)| &\leq C\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-\frac{1}{2}} (\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} + t^{-\frac{1}{4}}) \\ \left| m_{12}(t, x, z_1) - \frac{\delta^{-1}(z_1)k_1}{\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0)} \right| + \left| m_{21}(t, x, z_1) - \frac{\delta(z_1)k_2}{\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0)} \right| &\leq C\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} t^{-\frac{3}{4}}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 3.7, we have $E(z_1) = 1 + O(\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}t^{-\frac{3}{4}})$. By Lemma 3.9, we have similar expansions for $W_R(z_1)$ and $U_R(z_1)$. We furthermore know by Proposition 3.3 that $|\delta^\pm(z_1)| \leq 1 + \rho^2$ for $\rho = \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$. From Section 3.1.1, we recall the expansion

$$P(\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0)) = 1 + \frac{P_1}{\sqrt{8t}(z_1 - z_0)} + O(\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}t^{-1}),$$

where the O -term depends on a fixed $C = C(\lambda_0)$ and P_1 is given by (3.6). We also recall that $|k_1| + |k_2| < C\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})}$. These observations yield Lemma 4.3. $\square$

Now we start to analyze the term $\mathbf{B}$ in (4.3). Consider the following inequalities:

$$|e^{-ixz_1}m_{11}(t, x, z_1)| > 10 \left| \frac{c_1m_{12}(t, x, z_1)e^{ixz_1+4itz_1^2}}{2i\operatorname{Im}(z_1)} \right|, \quad (4.7)$$

$$10|e^{-ixz_1}m_{21}(t, x, z_1)| < \left| \frac{c_1m_{22}(t, x, z_1)e^{ixz_1+4itz_1^2}}{2i\operatorname{Im}(z_1)} \right|. \quad (4.8)$$

Lemma 4.4. *Given $\varepsilon_0 > 0$ small, there exist $T(\varepsilon_0) > 0$ and $C > 0$ such that, if $\|\tilde{r}\|_{H^1(\mathbb{R})} < \varepsilon_0$ and if (t, x) is such that at least one of (4.7)–(4.8) is false, then we have $|\mathbf{B}| < Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon$ for $t \geq T(\varepsilon_0)$.*

Proof. Let us start by assuming that for (t, x) inequality (4.7) is false. We are only interested to the case when t is large. For the ϵ of (1.4) and $\rho = \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}$, Lemma 4.3 implies for $t \geq T$,

$$\begin{aligned} |m_{12}| &\leq (1 + \rho^2)|k_1|t^{-\frac{1}{2}} + C\epsilon t^{-\frac{3}{4}} \\ &\leq t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon K \left(\frac{1}{2}(1 + \rho^2)^{-1} - Ct^{-\frac{3}{4}} - C\epsilon \right) \\ &\leq t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon K|m_{22}|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.9)$$

for a fixed and sufficiently large constant K . Then, if (4.7) is false and $t \geq T$, both terms in (4.7) are bounded from above by

$$\left| \frac{c_1m_{22}(t, x, z_1)e^{ixz_1+4itz_1^2}}{2i\operatorname{Im}(z_1)} \right|.$$

For $t \geq T$ by the same argument of (4.9) we have also

$$|e^{-ixz_1}m_{21}(t, x, z_1)| \leq t^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon K |e^{-ixz_1}m_{11}(t, x, z_1)|. \quad (4.10)$$

We conclude that for $t \geq T$ and if (t, x) is in the domain where (4.7) is false, we have for some fixed K

$$|\mathbf{B}| \leq K \frac{|m_{12}e^{ixz_1-4itz_1^2}\overline{m_{22}}e^{-ix\bar{z}_1-4it\bar{z}_1^2}|}{|m_{22}e^{ixz_1+4itz_1^2}|^2} = K \frac{|m_{12}|}{|m_{22}|} \leq \frac{CK}{\sqrt{t}}\epsilon. \quad (4.11)$$

So now we assume that (t, x) is such that (4.7) is true. Notice that by (4.10) and (4.7) we have for a fixed K

$$\frac{|b_1 e^{ix\bar{z}_1} \overline{m_{21}}|}{\|b\|^2} \leq K \frac{|e^{-ixz_1} m_{11} e^{ix\bar{z}_1} \overline{m_{21}}|}{|e^{-ixz_1} m_{11}|^2} = K \frac{|m_{21}|}{|m_{11}|} \leq \frac{CK}{\sqrt{t}} \epsilon. \quad (4.12)$$

Since we are assuming that (t, x) is such that (4.7)–(4.8) are not both true, we assume now that (4.7) is true and (4.8) is false. Then by (4.12), for a fixed K

$$|B| \leq 4 |\operatorname{Im} z_1| \frac{|b_1 b_2|}{\|b\|^2} \leq K \frac{|b_1 e^{ix\bar{z}_1} \overline{m_{21}}|}{\|b\|^2} \leq \frac{CK}{\sqrt{t}} \epsilon. \quad (4.13)$$

The above inequalities prove Lemma 4.4 for values of (t, x) , for which (4.7)–(4.8) are not both true. $\square$

We assume now that (4.7)–(4.8) are true. Then, by the last inequality in (4.11) and by (4.12), up to terms bounded by $Ct^{-\frac{1}{2}}\epsilon$, what is left is the analysis of

$$-2i \frac{e^{-ixz_1} m_{11} \bar{c}_1 \overline{m_{22}} e^{-ix\bar{z}_1 - 4it\bar{z}_1^2}}{\|b\|^2}. \quad (4.14)$$

Set now

$$b^2 := |e^{-ixz_1} m_{11}|^2 + \left| \frac{c_1 m_{22} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}}{2i \operatorname{Im}(z_1)} \right|^2$$

and expand

$$\|b\|^2 = b^2 \left(1 + O \left(b^{-1} \left| c_1 m_{12} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2} \right| \right) + O \left(b^{-1} |m_{21} e^{-ixz_1}| \right) \right).$$

Then the quantity in (4.14) is of the form

$$\begin{aligned} & -2i e^{-ixz_1} m_{11} \frac{\bar{c}_1 \overline{m_{22}} e^{-ix\bar{z}_1 - 4it\bar{z}_1^2}}{b^2} \times \\ & \left(1 + O \left(b^{-1} \left| c_1 m_{12} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2} \right| \right) + O \left(b^{-1} |m_{21} e^{-ixz_1}| \right) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

We claim that the quantity in (4.15) equals

$$\begin{aligned} & -2i \frac{e^{-ixz_1} \delta(z_1) (\bar{\delta}(z_1))^{-1} \bar{c}_1 e^{-ix\bar{z}_1 - 4it\bar{z}_1^2}}{|e^{-ixz_1} \delta(z_1)|^2 + \left| \frac{c_1 e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}}{2i \operatorname{Im}(z_1)} \delta(z_1)^{-1} \right|^2} (1 + O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})). \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

To prove this claim, we observe that since $m_{ii} = \delta^{(-1)^i}(z_1) + O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ and $|\delta^{\pm 1}(z_1)| \geq \langle \rho \rangle^{-2}$, we have

$$b^2 = |e^{-ixz_1} \delta(z_1)|^2 + \left| \frac{c_1 e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}}{2i \operatorname{Im}(z_1)} \delta(z_1)^{-1} \right|^2 (1 + O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})).$$

We have $O\left(b^{-1}\left|c_1 m_{12} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}\right|\right) = O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ by

$$b^{-1}\left|c_1 m_{12} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}\right| \leq \frac{\left|m_{12} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}\right|}{\left|m_{22} e^{ixz_1 + 4itz_1^2}\right|} = \frac{|m_{12}|}{|m_{22}|} \leq C\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

We have $O\left(b^{-1}\left|m_{21} e^{ix\bar{z}_1}\right|\right) = O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$ by

$$b^{-1}\left|m_{21} e^{-ixz_1}\right| \leq \frac{\left|m_{21} e^{-ixz_1}\right|}{\left|m_{11} e^{-ixz_1}\right|} = \frac{|m_{21}|}{|m_{11}|} \leq C\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Hence (4.16) is proved.

Now we look at the term in (4.16). For $z_1 = \alpha_1 + i\beta_1$, $d_1 = \log(\frac{|c_1|}{2\beta_1})$ and $\vartheta_1 = \arg(\bar{c}_1)$, dropping the factor $(1 + O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}))$, for $\Delta(z_1)$ defined in (3.17) and inserting trivial factors $\Delta/\Delta = 1$ and $\bar{\Delta}/\bar{\Delta} = 1$, the expression in (4.16) equals

$$\frac{-4i\beta_1 e^{-2i\alpha_1 x - 4it(\alpha_1^2 - \beta_1^2) + i\vartheta_1} \frac{\delta(z_1)}{\Delta(z_1)} \frac{\bar{\Delta}(z_1)}{\bar{\delta}(z_1)} \frac{\Delta(z_1)}{\Delta(z_1)}}{e^{2\beta_1 x + 8t\alpha_1\beta_1 - d_1} \left|\frac{\delta(z_1)}{\Delta(z_1)}\right| |\Delta(z_1)| + e^{-(2\beta_1 x + 8t\alpha_1\beta_1 - d_1)} \left|\frac{\Delta(z_1)}{\delta(z_1)}\right| |\Delta(z_1)|^{-1}}. \quad (4.17)$$

Fix now a constant $\kappa > 0$. Then (4.17) differs from the soliton solution

$$-2i\beta_1 e^{-2i\alpha_1 x - 4it(\alpha_1^2 - \beta_1^2) + i\vartheta_1 + 2i\arg(\Delta(z_1))} \operatorname{sech}(2\beta_1 x + 8t\alpha_1\beta_1 - d_1 + \log(|\Delta(z_1)|)) \quad (4.18)$$

by less than $\kappa \epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$. To prove this claim we observe that the difference of (4.17) and (4.18) can be bounded, up to a constant factor $C = C(\omega_0, v_0)$, by the sum of the following two error terms:

$$\frac{\left|\frac{\delta(z_1)}{\Delta(z_1)} \frac{\bar{\Delta}(z_1)}{\bar{\delta}(z_1)} - 1\right|}{e^{8\beta_1 t|z_0 - \alpha_1|} (1 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^2)^{-1}} \quad (4.19)$$

and

$$\left| \operatorname{sech}(8\beta_1 t(-z_0 + \alpha_1) - d_1 + \log(|\Delta(z_1)|)) - \operatorname{sech}\left(8\beta_1 t(-z_0 + \alpha_1) - d_1 + \log(|\Delta(z_1)|) + \log\left(\frac{|\delta(z_1)|}{|\Delta(z_1)|}\right)\right) \right|. \quad (4.20)$$

We bound first (4.19). For $|z_0 - \alpha_1| \geq \kappa t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$ formula (4.19) is bounded by $Ce^{-8\beta_1 \kappa \sqrt{t}} \epsilon$ by (3.17). For $|z_0 - \alpha_1| \leq \kappa t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$, for a fixed K and using (3.18) we bound (4.19) by

$$(1 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^2) \left| \frac{\delta(z_1)}{\Delta(z_1)} \frac{\bar{\Delta}(z_1)}{\bar{\delta}(z_1)} - 1 \right| \leq 4 \frac{C}{\sqrt{t}} \log(1 + \|\tilde{r}\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})}^2) \leq K t^{-\frac{1}{2}} \epsilon^2.$$

By Lagrange Theorem, (4.20) is bounded by

$$C \operatorname{sech}\left(8\beta_1 t(-z_0 + \alpha_1) - d_1 + \log(|\Delta(z_1)|) + c \log\left(\frac{|\delta(z_1)|}{|\Delta(z_1)|}\right)\right) \left| \log\left(\frac{|\delta(z_1)|}{|\Delta(z_1)|}\right) \right|$$

for some $c \in (0, 1)$. This satisfies bounds similar to those satisfied by (4.19).

To complete the proof of Theorem 1.3, we need to show that when one of (4.7)–(4.8) is false, then the function in (4.18) is $O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$. By Lemma 4.3 the fact that (4.7), resp.(4.8), false means that for a fixed $C = C(\rho_0) > 0$ we have

$$|e^{-2ixz_1 - 4itz_1^2}| = e^{2(\beta_1 x + 4t\alpha_1 \beta_1)} \leq C\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}$$

and

$$|e^{2ix\bar{z}_1 + 4itz_1^2}| = e^{-2(\beta_1 x + 4t\alpha_1 \beta_1)} \leq C\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

Any of these yields our claim that the function in (4.18) is $O(\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}})$.

This completes the proof of Theorem 1.3 for $u_0 \in \Sigma_1 := H^1(\mathbb{R}) \cap L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$. Notice that for $t \geq T(\varepsilon_0)$ the soliton in formula (1.6) is given by formula (4.18).

When $u_0 \in L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$ but $u_0 \notin H^1(\mathbb{R})$, we consider a sequence $u_n \in \Sigma_1$ with $u_n \rightarrow u_0$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in $L^{2,1}(\mathbb{R})$. Then the sequence of spectral data from $\{u_n\}$ converges to the spectral datum of u_0 . This implies that for $t \geq T(\varepsilon_0)$ we have

$$\|u_n(t, \cdot) - \varphi_{\omega_n, \gamma_+^{(n)}, v_n}(t, \cdot - x_+^{(n)})\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} < C\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (4.21)$$

with a fixed constant C , since C can be made to depend only on values of ε_0 and (ω_0, v_0) in Theorem 1.3. The sequence $\{(\omega_n, v_n)\}$ converges to the parameters of the soliton with spectral datum (z_1, c_1) obtained from the spectral datum (z_1, c_1, r) of u_0 . Finally, $\{(\gamma_+^{(n)}, x_+^{(n)})\}$ is a convergent sequence, as can be seen in (4.18) from their continuous dependence on the spectral data. This means that for almost any x and for any $t \geq T(\varepsilon_0)$, we have

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(u_n(t, x) - \varphi_{\omega_n, \gamma_+^{(n)}, v_n}(t, x - x_+^{(n)}) \right) = u(t, x) - \varphi_{\omega_1, \gamma_+, v_1}(t, x - x_+).$$

Hence, bound (4.21) implies that for any $t \geq T(\varepsilon_0)$, we have

$$\|u(t, \cdot) - \varphi_{\omega_1, \gamma_+, v_1}(t, \cdot - x_+)\|_{L^\infty(\mathbb{R})} \leq C\epsilon t^{-\frac{1}{2}}.$$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is complete.

References

- [1] Ablowitz, M. J.; Prinari, B.; Trubatch, A. D.; *Discrete and Continuous Nonlinear Schrödinger Systems* Cambridge University Press.
- [2] D. Bambusi, Asymptotic stability of ground states in some Hamiltonian PDEs with symmetry, arXiv:1107.5835v4 (2013).
- [3] Beals, R.; Coifman, R. R.; Scattering and inverse scattering for first order systems. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* **37** (1984), no. 1, 39–90

- [4] Buslaev, V.; Perelman, G.; Scattering for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation: states close to a soliton, *St. Petersburg Math. J.*, **4** (1993), pp. 1111–1142.
- [5] Buslaev, V.; Perelman, G.; On the stability of solitary waves for nonlinear Schrödinger equations, *Nonlinear evolution equations*, editor N.N. Uraltseva, Transl. Ser. 2, 164, Amer. Math. Soc., pp. 75–98, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence (1995).
- [6] Cuccagna, S.; The Hamiltonian structure of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the asymptotic stability of its ground states, *Comm. Math. Physics*, **305** 305 (2011), 279–331.
- [7] Cuccagna, S.; On asymptotic stability of moving ground states of the nonlinear Schrödinger equation, to appear *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*
- [8] Cuccagna, S.; On the Darboux and Birkhoff steps in the asymptotic stability of solitons, *Rend. Istit. Mat. Univ. Trieste* **44** (2012), 197–257.
- [9] Cuccagna, S.; Georgiev, V.; Visciglia, N.; Decay and scattering of small solutions of pure power NLS in $\mathbb{R}$ with $p > 3$ and with a potential, to appear *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*
- [10] Deift, P.; Park, J.; Long-time asymptotics for solutions of the NLS equation with a delta potential and even initial data. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN* **24** (2011), 5505–5624.
- [11] Deift, P.; Zhou, X. A steepest descent method for oscillatory Riemann-Hilbert problems. Asymptotics for the MKdV equation. *Ann. of Math.*, **137** (1993), no. 2, 295–368.
- [12] Deift, P.; Zhou, X.; Long-time asymptotics for solutions of the NLS equation with initial data in a weighted Sobolev space. *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **56** (2003), 1029–1077.
- [13] Deift, P.; Zhou, X. ; Long-time behavior of the non-focusing nonlinear Schrödinger equation, a case study. New Series: Lectures in Mathematical Sciences, 5. University of Tokyo, 1994.
- [14] Dieng, M.; McLaughlin, K.D.T.-R.; Long-time asymptotics for the NLS equation via $\bar{\partial}$ methods, arXiv:0805.2807.
- [15] Ginibre, J.; Velo, G.; On a class of nonlinear Schrödinger equations. I. The Cauchy problem, general case, *J. Funct. Anal.*, **32** (1979), 1–32.
- [16] Hayashi, N.; Naumkin, P.; Asymptotics for large time of solutions to the nonlinear Schrödinger and Hartree equations, *Amer. J. Math.* **120** (1998) , 369–389.
- [17] Kevrekidis, P.G.; Integrability revisited: a necessary condition *Physics Lett. A*, **285** (2001) 383–389.

- [18] McKean, H.; Shatah, J.; The nonlinear Schrödinger equation and the nonlinear heat equation reduction to linear form, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.* , **44** (1991) , 1067–1080.
- [19] Mizumachi, T.; Pelinovsky,D.; Backlund transformation and L^2 –stability of NLS solitons, *Int. Math. Res. Not.*, **2012** (2012), 2034–2067.
- [20] Pelinovsky, D.; Sulem, C.; Eigenfunctions and eigenvalues for a scalar Riemann–Hilbert problem associated to inverse scattering, *Comm. Math. Phys.* **208** (2000), 713–760.
- [21] Pillet,C.A.; Wayne,C.E.; Invariant manifolds for a class of dispersive, Hamiltonian partial differential equations *J. Diff. Eq.*, **141** (1997), pp. 310–326.
- [22] Soffer,A.; Weinstein, M.I.; Multichannel nonlinear scattering II. The case of anisotropic potentials and data, *J. Diff. Eq.*, **98** (1992), pp. 376–390.
- [23] Soffer,A.; Weinstein, M.I.; Resonances, radiation damping and instability in Hamiltonian nonlinear wave equations, *Invent. Math.*, **136** (1999), pp. 9–74.
- [24] Tsutsumi, Y.; L^2 solutions for the nonlinear Schrödinger equation and nonlinear groups, *Funkcial. Ekvac.*, **30** (1987), 115–125.
- [25] Weinstein, M.I.; Lyapunov stability of ground states of nonlinear dispersive equations, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **39** (1986), pp. 51–68.
- [26] Whittaker,E.T.; Watson,G.N.; *A course of modern analysis* Cambridge Math. Library Cambridge U. Press (1996).
- [27] Zhou, X. ; L^2 –Sobolev space bijectivity of the scattering and inverse scattering transforms, *Comm. Pure Appl. Math.*, **51** (1998), 697–731